DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 829 HE 001 515

TITLE	Coordination, Planning, and Governance of Higher Education in Colorado.
INSTITUTION	Colorado Commission on Higher Education, Denver.
PUB DATE	28 Feb 69
NOTE	31p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.65
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Organization, *Coordination, Educational Planning, *Governance, *Governing Boards, *Higher Education, *Planning, State Colleges, State Programs, State Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Colorado

ABSTRACT

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education was created in 1965 to help provide a unified and long-range view of higher education in the state and help devise a structure of higher education that would be responsive to a changing educational system, social needs and pressures. This report, which reviews the history and functions of the Commission, deals primarily with the goals and principles for a higher education organization and a discussion of the major alternatives. The goals and principles include: (1) relevancy to a diverse population; (2) diversity and specialization of institutions of higher education; (3) need for a lay governing board assisted by professional staff; (4) need for more than one lay board to cover the various components of higher education; (5) dedication of the head of each institution to that institution; and (6) provision of an overall view of educational goals and needs and of an overall assessment of performance. The structural alternatives are: a single governing board for higher education; a governing board for each institution within a structure of coordination; and governing boards for major sectors, within a structure of coordination. The alternatives are weighed and recommendations made for governing boards for each of the major sectors. (AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED039829

COORDINATION, PLANNING, AND GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN COLORADO

A report prepared by the Chairman and Executive Director of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education based upon Commission discussion, for review and comment by interested persons and groups.

HE 001 515

Colorado Commission on Higher Education
719 State Services Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

February 28, 1969

COORDINATION, PLANNING, AND GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN COLORADO

Foreword

Consideration of the structuring of higher education within state government is and should be an on-going task, for the best means of providing for overall planning, coordination, and support of rapidly-growing higher education programs are bound to change along with changing circumstances within government and within society at large.

During the current legislative session many proposals have been advanced looking to modification of the present arrangements for the governance of the higher education institutions and for the coordination and planning of the system as a whole. The Colorado Commission on Higher Education has been deeply interested in such matters throughout the three and one-half years of its service to the State. It has no interest in the perpetuation of its own role within the total structure, but it does believe that sound provisions through which the Legislature and the people of the State can maintain a statewide view, a view of the total need and total system of education beyond high school, is essential.

Accordingly the Commission seeks in the following statement to set forth background considerations which it hopes will help in the identification of the best means of providing for the needed systemwide and statewide view. It discusses some of the problems and possibilities involved in major alternative structural forms, and presents its own proposals for modifications in the present structure.

These proposals have been stated in this report by the Commission Chairman and Executive Director, based upon informal Commission discussions during the past year or more. They have not been formally adopted by the Commission, and will not be so adopted prior to opportunity for their review by interested individuals and groups, including the several governing boards concerned. They are put forward at this time in order to provide for such review and to present background and current thinking which the Commission hopes will assist members of the Legislature in determining upon appropriate action in the present legislative session.

This report, as it may be modified in light of comments and suggestions from governing boards and others, will constitute one chapter in a forthcoming publication of the Commission which will be an updating of its statewide planning document of November 1966, entitled Strengthening Higher Education in Colorado.

February 28, 1969

COORDINATION, PLANNING, AND GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN COLORADO

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education	2
The Initial Years	4
Goals for Higher Education Organization	8
Major Alternatives	12
1. Single Governing Board for Higher Education	12
2. A Governing Board for Each Institution Within a Structure of Coordination	15
3. Governing Boards for Major Sectors, Within a Structure of Coordination	16
Considerations in Weighing the Alternatives	18
Commission Proposals	23

COORDINATION, PLANNING, AND GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN COLORADO

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education was established by the Legislature in 1965 and came into operation in June of that year. Its establishment followed a good many years of consideration and experimentation by the Legislature as to ways and means of providing for a unified and long-range view of higher education in the state. Such a view was essential in order to assess current efforts, needed support levels, and desirable expansions. Over a period of years the Joint Budget Committee and the Legislative Committee on Education Beyond High School made significant efforts to fulfill this needed role. In the early 1960's in addition to these efforts, state funds were allocated for a staff directorate for the Association of State Institutions of Higher Education in Colorado, the voluntary association of public college and university presidents, which made further and important contributions to this end.

But at no time was a structure devised that was universally acknowledged to be satisfactory. The establishment of the Commission was, in this context, only an additional step in the search for an optimum structure. There is every reason to expect and to hope that the search will continue, in Colorado as it continues in most states. For even if a particular structure were deemed perfect in a given time and place, the system of higher education is growing and changing so rapidly in response to changing social needs and pressures that any structure must change or fall behind the needs of the times.

The Colorado Commission On Higher Education

The Act establishing the Commission provided for a bi-partisan body of seven laymen appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Senate to have responsibility for planning for the development of post-high school educational opportunities, and for coordinating institutions and their programs in the interest of maximizing the range and quality of these opportunities, "with due consideration of . . . the ability of the state to support public higher education"--all of this to be accomplished with recognition of "the constitutional and statutory responsibilities of duly constituted governing boards of institutions of higher education in Colorado." The Act provided for an Advisory Committee comprising designated representatives of both Houses of the General Assembly and of the several governing boards. The Commission was authorized to employ an executive director to serve at its pleasure, and the director in turn, to employ staff within approved budgets.

The principal assignments of responsibility and authority to the Commission are these:

1. The Commission reviews operating budget requests of the institutions of higher education, and provides comments and recommendations including judgments concerning priorities, to the Governor. It does substantially the same with capital construction requests. While this "authority" is recommendatory only, the role of the Commission in budget-building is the principal source of its influence with governing boards and institutions, and it is of importance in its relations with the Legislature as well.

2. The Commission is empowered to approve preliminary planning for

capital construction projects and for long-range construction planning more generally.

3. The Commission reviews and may approve or deny any "new degree program" proposed to be offered in any of the colleges supported by the State.

4. By Executive Order and now by virtue of the Reorganization Act, within a framework of planning which is to encompass all state agencies, the Commission reviews plans and operations of institutions of higher education relating to automatic data processing.

5. The Commission serves as the state agency to administer the federal Higher Education Facilities Act and several other federal programs as assigned by the Governor.

Other functions of the Commission are advisory in nature--such as reviewing existing programs, roles, and functions of the colleges, recommending on the establishment of new institutions, making studies and reports relative to plans and policies for higher education, and cooperating with the controller, auditor and other state agencies in various fiscal and administrative matters.

The Reorganization Act of 1968 created the Department of Higher Education and designated the Executive Director of the Commission as its head. It brought the Commission and the institutions of higher education and their governing boards within the Department but left unchanged their relationships to executive and legislative agencies, including the head of the Department. It also brought into the Department the State Historical Society, Council on Arts and Humanities, and Scientific Development

Commission, with provision that the Executive Director's authority respecting these three divisions would be the same as that assigned by the Act to other heads of executive departments.

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education is, in broad strokes, an agency intended to help the Governor and Legislature see the big issues in higher education and hopefully to make the right decisions, whether in the establishment of new institutions, the closing out of old programs, the funding of new buildings, the establishment of support levels for regular operations. It is an agency whose only reason for being is to strengthen the total system of higher education, an agency which must nevertheless disappoint some of the aspirations of individual institutions, and of individual communities, and of individual legislators, in the interest of proceeding according to priorities of the State.

The Initial Years

When the Colorado Commission on Higher Education was established in 1965, the four boards having governing responsibility for the state colleges and universities acknowledged the need for a coordinating mechanism, but the implications of assigning to a new coordinating board some of the functions and authority previously exercised by the governing boards, or left unassigned, could be only imperfectly foreseen.

Developments since 1965 within the structure of the governing boards have affected the higher education organization in Colorado significantly.

1. In 1965 the Trustees of the State Colleges in Colorado acted in effect as five boards, serving individually as a board for each of the state

colleges. There was no Board staff until 1962; in 1965 there was only the Secretary and his clerical support. Institution administrations gave staff services to the Board, with the Secretary providing a "secretariat" function as distinguished from a planning or management function.

Since 1965 this condition has changed and the change has markedly affected provisions for coordination of higher education in Colorado. The Board has taken a number of steps to deal with the colleges as a unified group of institutions. It considers such matters as the development of new programs, formulation of budget requests, and faculty and student personnel policies for the five colleges as they interrelate within a system rather than on a discrete basis for each college. To accomplish these policy and procedural changes the Board has leaned increasingly on a growing central staff as well as on systemwide committees staffed by central office personnel.

2. The State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education has been created; it is organized in two Divisions and the Secretary's office. The Division of Occupational Education is essentially the former office of the Board for Vocational Education. The Secretary serves a "secretariat" function relating to meetings of the Board and performs services of Board representation. The Division of Community Colleges is the "central office" for the new State Community College System and successor to the junior college office of the State Board of Education respecting the local district junior colleges. This office exercises the full range of coordinating and governing tasks of the Trustees of the State Colleges. Like the State College Trustees, this board has been expanding its coordinating role concurrently with the Commission.

3. Some limitations long inherent in the structure of other boards have become more evident since 1965. The rural orientation of the State Board of Agriculture looms as an important limitation in the planning and operation of a modern complex university. Operation of Fort Lewis College by this board was appropriate when that college was a specialized two-year "A&M" institution, but there is no educational or managerial rationale for its governance by the board for Colorado State University since Fort Lewis has (in 1962) become a four-year liberal arts college. Suggestions for changes in the Board of Trustees of the Colorado School of Mines were made by the Task Force appointed by the Commission to study the role of the School, in the Task Force report of January 1968: "The Task Force recommends that the term of continuous service of individual members be limited and that the board have better representation from nonalumni and from other activities than the mineral industry. A somewhat larger board might also provide a means whereby the voice of the general community can be heard." Since 1965, limitations in arrangements respecting the Regents of the University of Colorado have been rather prominently on display. The small size of the Board combined with its selection in partisan elections brings into undue prominence issues, and personalities, that divide the Board. The constitutional provision that the University's chief executive officer is also the Board's presiding officer forces this officer into the untenable position, when the Board is split, of determining issues of policy that are the responsibility of the Board.

At the state coordinating level there have been significant changes since 1965 also. Steps have been taken by the Colorado Commission on

Higher Education to spell out plans for the statewide development of the public system of education beyond high school and to delineate the roles and functions of institutions and groups of institutions within the overall system. Coordination of institution programs, and controls over institution growth to be consistent with institution roles within the statewide plans, have been initiated. The development of a comprehensive system of information about enrollments, physical facilities, and instructional output is well advanced, upon the basis of which more detailed and authoritative policies and guidelines relating to current performance and needed directions of development and financial support can be based.

Since the establishment of the Commission there have been several proposals for modifying the structure of higher education coordination and governance, and in the current legislative session a wide range of proposals has been advanced. It has been proposed in each of the past three years that a single board of regents or trustees be created to govern all of the senior colleges and universities. The Commission proposed to the Legislative Committee on Reorganization, in 1968, that a board be established (through appropriate constitutional and legislative changes) to govern the University of Colorado, Colorado State University, and the Colorado School of Mines. Another proposal is that CSU, CSM, Colorado State College at Greeley, and the centers of the University of Colorado be made "campuses, centers and branches" of the University of Colorado at Boulder under a Board of Regents appointed by the Governor. Under another, these same units would become components of the University of Colorado governed by the Regents as now constituted. Yet another idea

is that CSC be administered by the State Board of Agriculture along with CSU, and that Fort Lewis College be transferred to the State Colleges board. Still another is that the State abandon altogether its efforts to plan and coordinate in higher education and abolish the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

Goals For Higher Education Organization

Though there is no national "model," there are certain goals for a higher education system and means for fostering such a system which are broadly accepted in Colorado and throughout the country.

First, higher education that is relevant to the needs of a highly diverse population, to education for effective citizenship and to the requirements of our varied public and private enterprise, must include a very wide span of learning opportunities. Higher education today has to be a far cry from that of the early 1800's, when law, medicine, and the ministry were the only pursuits for which a college education was expected.

Thus, second, the development of an effective overall program of higher education is a many-sided task. No single institution can excel across the wide and varied range of needed programs.

As in other areas of human enterprise, this means, third, that specialties have developed among higher education institutions. In the mid-19th century, so far as public education institutions are concerned there were only the universities. Later the land-grant colleges and the normal schools and state colleges developed, meeting needs quite different from those fulfilled by the universities; and in recent years the two-year

community junior colleges have emerged as a major and rapidly-growing component of the total system of education beyond high school. In most states today in the public sector of higher education there are comprehensive universities, general colleges which typically have developed out of the former normal schools and teachers colleges, two-year community junior colleges, and sometimes, specialized institutions such as the Colorado School of Mines.

To take the basic responsibility for fostering, evaluating, and determining the policies governing public higher education institutions in America, the board of lay citizens has acted as an intermediary between the political officers of government (executive and legislative) on the one hand and the professionals who actually operate the institutions (faculty and administration) on the other. The usefulness of the lay governing board is proven in the unparalled development of post-high school educational opportunities in this country as compared to any other. Without claiming that the lay board is the only factor in this development, it seems evident that the lay governing board has been an effective liaison between the institutions and political officers who are directly answerable to the majority will within the framework of our constitutional system. The lay governing board represents a fourth characteristic or principle which helps point to a desirable organization structure.

It is notable that the essential tasks of the lay board involve the setting, within a statewide policy framework, of major policy guidelines for institutional growth, the development of needed support, and the selection of the professional leadership. Lay boards discharging essentially

these same tasks have been used in America to operate the public schools as well as individual colleges and universities and systems of colleges and universities.

To be effective, fifth, lay boards comprising citizen members whose full-time occupations demand most of their energies, require professional staff assistance in the formulation and follow-up of the board's business.

A sixth characteristic or principle affecting higher education structure is that a single lay body within each state is an insufficient means for fulfilling the tasks of the lay board with respect to the wide span of educational programming. With so many educational components, a single board can devote little time to the affairs of any. The board staff rather than the board itself becomes the critical agency for the assessment of information and of policy recommendations. In most states there are at the state level separate boards concerned with the public schools, the post-secondary education system, and post-high school institutions or groups of institutions within that system.

Seventh, it is natural and appropriate that the professional head of each institution be essentially single-minded in his loyalties and dedication to the objectives of his own institution. His partisanship is partially duplicated in the board he serves, but as a citizen group drawn from the wider community this body should be sensitive to the wider needs and goals of the state.

With the institution head dedicated to the focused goals of the institution, and with the governing board charged with fostering and determining the guiding policies for an institution or group of institutions, it

is essential, eighth, that means be provided for the effectuation of an overall view of educational needs and goals of the state and for an overall assessment of performance. In the past when higher education was a much smaller segment of state activity, governors and legislative committees attempted to fulfill this function. Under present circumstances, virtually all states have found it necessary to provide for public higher education the kind of overall planning and coordination by a lay board and staff which for many decades the states have provided for public school affairs.

Major Alternatives

The task of organizing the total higher education system so as to foster the individuality of institutions which meet differing aspects of the total need, without promoting local and partisan influences that will obstruct or even prevent accomplishment of statewide objectives and priorities--this is the task we face in appraising the structure for planning and coordinating higher education in Colorado.

The Commission hopes that the following discussion of major alternatives to the present structure, against the background considerations just reviewed, will be helpful in assessing possible modifications that will strengthen the system as a whole.

1. The Single Governing Board for Higher Education

One statewide board of higher education, appointed by the Governor with Senate confirmation, would carry out the functions of planning, coordinating and governing all of the institutions of higher education which are now undertaken in Colorado by five governing boards and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

Boards of trustees (or regents) are ordinarily empowered by law to hold property, approve courses of study, prescribe qualifications for admission of students, appoint institution officers including faculty members, fix salaries, provide the buildings, award degrees and diplomas, and generally to have direct operating responsibility for the institution or institutions governed. The single statewide governing body would discharge these

responsibilities for all institutions and in addition would function as a planning agency responsible for locating needed new programs and institutions. It might also operate the several federal programs which now are administered by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

The single governing board has the advantages, and the limitations, that go with central planning and control.

A single governing body has the virtue that lines of authority are readily understood--they run exclusively to the governing board, except as that body shares its authority by delegation to the institutions governed. Since there need be no coordinating board, there is no confusion of function or authority between the governing board and a coordinating body, the powers of which are superior in the areas in which the Legislature empowers the coordinating board to act.

With a single board responsible for all of the institutions, centralized planning and direction for institutional development is possible. Needless duplication of programs, staffing, or facilities can readily be avoided.

The single governing body has a number of limitations:

1. It involves as lay persons in the planning and development and support of higher education only the limited number of its own members whereas in Colorado today there are 42 lay men and women involved in the governance and coordination of higher education. The limited number of laymen involved reduces the effectiveness both of lay control and of lay representation to the public of the needs of higher education.

2. The single governing board which has responsibility for as many as nine senior colleges and universities and an additional number of two-year colleges has too wide a variety and too numerous a group of institutions to be able to establish a deep knowledge of any one of them. This reduces the board's ability to respond effectively to the request of the president of any institution for guidance; or to have the knowledge necessary to determine issues arising between institutions or between any of the institutions and the board's own staff.

3. A single governing body must either delegate large elements of authority to the institutions, in which case its potential for centralized planning and control is reduced; or it must lodge this authority in the board's staff. The latter practice creates a kind of super-presidency and a central bureaucracy upon which the board necessarily depends, but which is a long step removed from direct knowledge of the campuses. The effect of a single governing board is to reduce the power of laymen to control higher education either by vesting that power in a central staff or by leaving the development of the institutions largely to the presidents.

4. While it is possible that a single governing board might operate the two-year as well as the four-year institutions, proposals advanced in the Colorado Legislature in recent years have not placed the junior colleges within the proposed central structure. To include the junior colleges is to increase the number of institutions governed to unmanageable proportions and to risk the overshadowing of their unique programs by the more traditional

four-year schools; to leave them out is to create a need for a separate body to coordinate the two-year and senior college systems.

II. A Governing Board for Each Institution Within a Structure of Coordination

At the other extreme from the single governing board is the plan under which each institution has its own governing body, and all of the governing boards are subject to the coordinating powers of a central planning and coordinating body such as the Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

Under this alternative, the head of the institution and his staff ordinarily constitute the only staff that the governing board has or needs. When boards operate groups of several institutions they require a central staff of their own to review and report upon institution proposals and performance indicators. Thus, though providing a separate board for each institution may appear to be a proliferation of boards, this plan actually reduces the numbers of staff members needed to serve the boards.

The advantages of providing a governing board for each institution within a structure of coordination include the involvement of a large number of lay persons in the development of higher education and the provision of a knowledgeable group of laymen who are committed to the well-being of each institution and to the review of policies and programs advanced by the college administration. Lay as against professional control is emphasized.

Disadvantages include the possibility of a fragmented growth of higher education through excessive competition among institutions and local pressure in behalf of particular institutions or programs.

The extent to which the disadvantages can be avoided and the advantages realized will depend upon the authority assigned to and the effectiveness achieved by the coordinating mechanism.

III. Governing Boards for Major Sectors, Within a Structure of Coordination

Something of a middle ground between the single governing board of Alternative I and the decentralized-but-coordinated system represented by Alternative II is the proposal advanced by the Commission in 1968 that the structure of higher education in Colorado comprise governing boards for (a) university, (b) college, and (c) community college sectors, with a coordinating commission. Under this plan, which represents a further extension of the present practice of grouping several institutions under some of the governing boards, the University of Colorado, Colorado State University, and the Colorado School of Mines would be governed by a single board; the Trustees of the State Colleges in Colorado would continue to govern the five state colleges and Fort Lewis College would be added to their jurisdiction; and the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education would continue to operate the system of community junior colleges. Each of the three boards would be in some respects a "coordinating-governing" board.

Such an organization of the governing structure for higher education might give emphasis to the special qualities of each of the major sectors of higher education--the comprehensive, open-door feature of the community colleges; the teaching emphasis which characterizes the state colleges; the particular emphasis upon advanced levels of instruction and upon research at

the universities. Since one board would be governing all of the institutions of a kind, this plan might also serve to tighten up control over program development, to encourage the sharing of resources, and to avoid needless duplication.

Possible disadvantages include the following:

1. The current two-sector "coordinating-governing" boards operate with staff which review information and proposals coming from the institutions and prepare recommendations for the board. Such boards cannot exercise their responsibilities of evaluation and decision-making without staff support. However, review at the governing board level does not remove the need for a subsequent review at the coordinating board level, where systemwide and statewide criteria must be applied. Thus some overlapping of authority and duplication of effort seems inevitable.

2. Creation of a governing structure parallel to the functional organization of higher education might lead to competition for students and for resources between the major sectors of higher education. There is evidence that this has happened in California.

3. Because they govern a number of institutions which have strong constituencies among students, alumni, and local residents, coordinating-governing boards may be in a position to muster significant political support in behalf of their interests as compared to the systemwide and generalized goals of the coordinating board. The longrange, generalized goals and policies of the coordinating board may prove less compelling politically than the pointed objectives of partisan groups, at any one time.

Considerations in Weighing the Alternatives

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education believes that lay boards have been a major strength of higher education in the United States, and that their contribution to the governance of the institutions of higher education will be at least as vital in the difficult years ahead as it has been in the past. The Commission believes also that institutions gain strength and exhibit greater imagination and capability in dealing with their special opportunities and problems when a maximum of authority consistent with systemwide goals and priorities is left at the institution level. Granting the need for statewide planning and coordination, nevertheless institution identity and aspiration represent the "engine" that drives the higher education machine.

For these reasons and others referred to above, the Commission submits that the disadvantages of the single governing board (Alternative I) outweigh the advantages. The Commission believes that the best plan for Colorado continues to be one in which the several governing boards operate within a structure of statewide planning and coordination established by a coordinating commission as authorized by law.

There could be important advantages in an arrangement under which each institution would have its own governing board. As guidelines for the development of the system as a whole and for institution growth are established by the Commission, the advantages of direct participation by lay boards responsible for each institution would outweigh the possible disadvantages.

This plan avoids the necessity for a layer of central staff to serve a governing board which operates several institutions. Thus this plan avoids the duplication and even conflict in review and approval functions which arises when coordinating-governing board staffs operate independently of the staff of the overall coordinating body.

However the Commission sees possible advantages also in the Alternative III arrangement with three governing boards responsible respectively for community colleges, state colleges, and universities. Though there are differences which distinguish each of the institutions, there are similarities among schools in each of the major sectors, and boards directly familiar with the similarities and differences should be able to set priorities for growth and for support in ways that would maximize strength and minimize cost.

The present Colorado structure represents a middle ground between Alternatives II and III, with coordinating-governing boards in the community college and state college sectors (in the latter, operating all of the relevant institutions except Fort Lewis), and with governing boards for the University of Colorado, Colorado School of Mines, and Colorado State University (excepting that the CSU board functions also as the board for Fort Lewis College). It would be a relatively short move to the three-board arrangement of Alternative III and only a somewhat longer move to provide each institution with its own board as indicated in Alternative II.

Still further variations, such as retaining one or both coordinating-governing boards as they now exist, while providing individual boards for the remaining institutions, are possible.

Even more important than a decision as to how many governing boards to have and how much grouping of institutions to do is the clarification of coordinating board-governing board functions and the effectuation of coordinating board leadership in shaping the system as a whole. The coordinating board is concerned with and must have the requisite authority relating to all aspects of the operation of the institutions as they meet, or fail to meet, the needs of the State for higher education opportunity within the limited resources that can be made available. Planning and coordination responsibilities and authority assigned the coordinating board must encompass the specification of functions and goals of the principal sectors of the higher education system. They must include the determination of missions and goals and enrollment growth of each institution within the sectors, since each institution in important ways is distinctive and affects significantly the total state capability in higher education. Responsibilities of the coordinating board involve plans for the development of new programs and the review of existing programs as they interrelate with those of other institutions. They involve facility planning as it relates to institution mission. They involve fiscal support levels for institution operations, appropriate to the differing roles and programs of the institutions. In a general way they must encompass concern for efficiency and economy of operations.

The governing boards are not debarred from these areas that are of major concern to the coordinating board; indeed, these policies involving mission and role, rates of growth, program development, facility planning, support levels are the most important policy questions affecting the institutions. Governing boards are likely to feel that a coordinating board that disagrees with their judgment on such matters is "telling them how to run their school" and interfering in fundamental "board business." They are right. Presumably the Legislature has created the coordinating board precisely to intervene in matters of planning and development and support of individual institutions and groups of institutions--to intervene with statewide goals and criteria. In the development of the guidelines the institutions and boards certainly should have a voice, but not a determining voice. In this purposeful intervention the distinction between a coordinating approach and a single governing board approach is that in the latter case there are no institution or sector boards to fight for their institution or sector or to feel aggrieved when they are overruled!

At the present time in Colorado there is a good deal of confusion in relationships between the coordinating commission and the governing boards which operate also as coordinating bodies for groups of institutions. These coordinating-governing boards have been endeavoring to create the ground-rules for their subsystems of institutions at the same time the Commission has been working to provide plans and guidelines for the system as a whole. Inevitably some differences have arisen--as in determining the appropriate

level of tuition in the community college sector, or in the appropriate standard for staffing in the state colleges, or in the standards to be employed in planning for allocations of space.

It is of critical importance that guidelines in all areas that affect statewide goals, priorities, and resources be developed by the Commission. It is essential that the Commission develop the information which is required to sustain such guidelines. It is essential that the several institutions and boards be involved by the Commission in the establishment of such guidelines. And when the plans and guidelines and standards have been promulgated relevant to the system of higher education as a whole, it is essential that these plans and guides be applied throughout the system. They can be and will be subjected to continuing study, consultation, and review, but the systemwide criteria must be supreme.

It should be apparent that the coordinating board must have the resources required to develop the information base, to bring about the consultation needed, and to crystalize and then to effectuate the overall plans and standards. It should be apparent also that this is no easy task: even to generate comparable information from institutions which have long operated without common definitions and policies requires a great deal of time and effort. But major progress has been made, and both in physical facilities planning and in the operating phases, the development and delineation of statewide guidelines is well under way.

COMMISSION PROPOSALS

The Commission advances its proposals for structuring of the state's public higher education system with full recognition that the issues involved are complex and that the Commission's three and one-half years of experience do not necessarily represent all of the experience that would be relevant in finding the best solution. It points out that it is the prerogative of the Legislature to determine the objectives it seeks to achieve through its higher education structure; that there are no tested models from this state or others which give fair assurance of the best way to achieve those objectives; that complex issues of both statutory and constitutional law are involved. The Commission will wish to assist in every possible way in weighing alternatives.

It seems to the Commission that the objective of overriding importance is to develop a structure that will keep always at the fore the concept of higher education as a total system in which all the elements are of significance only through the contributions they make to the goals of the system as a whole. Within the institutions, and at the level of the governing boards, there will be worthy objectives that are partisan rather than systemwide; but the structure as a whole must provide for bringing partisan viewpoints and goals together and for enforcing guidelines that are derived from systemwide objectives.

The Commission believes that the principle of lay control of education is too important to be taken for granted. The important decisions

concerning direction of institutional program and growth as these decisions contribute to shaping of the overall system in response to the needs of the State--these decisions should be made by lay persons who are involved in and therefore competent to make decisions concerning institution program and growth. Of course the overriding decisions in these matters will be made by the Legislature; and of course the processes of coming to decision on such matters will deeply involve faculties and students and administrators and others close to the institution communities. But the lay board of trustees and the lay coordinating board have a crucial role to play as intermediary between the interests internal to the institution and those of the public which supports or declines to support the institutions. The Commission therefore seeks a structure in which lay boards make the key policy decisions.

Related to the primacy of the lay board is the principle that public higher education should not be run by a large centralized bureaucracy. If there is but one board, or if there are several boards but the boards are honorific rather than actively involved, the forces which today require a large measure of central planning and coordination in the higher education sector of state government will necessarily bring about a large and powerful bureaucracy to get the job done. The Commission believes that such a bureaucracy is inconsistent with the needed independence of higher education institutions from partisan interference of all kinds, and with the degree of institutional creativity and imagination and innovation that a healthy higher education system requires if it is to meet the rapidly-growing and rapidly-changing needs of our day.

For these reasons, the Commission continues to favor a system built upon the principle of coordination rather than on the principle of central direction and control. It is fully aware that coordination involves some frustrations for both governing boards and coordinating board as a result of the fact that responsibilities in the key areas of policy affecting institution growth are shared. It believes that the proposals that follow will reduce such frustrations to tolerable levels while preserving the independence and encouraging the institutional initiative and imagination that higher education needs.

The Commission's proposals involve specific arrangements (a) with respect to the boards and (b) with respect to staffing.

(a) Governing boards should be provided for each of the three major sectors of higher education--the community junior colleges, state colleges, and universities. Each board should comprise nine members. The community college board should govern two-year institutions in the State system and continue its current role respecting local district colleges. The state college board should govern the five state colleges it now operates (including the special purpose institution, Colorado State College), and Fort Lewis College should be transferred to its jurisdiction. The university board should govern the University of Colorado, Colorado State University, and the Colorado School of Mines.

To foster and encourage a broad acquaintance by board members with the three sectors of the higher education system and their orientation

to the well-being of the entire system rather than simply of a single institution or sector, governing boards should be made up exclusively of persons appointed from a higher education panel, the members of which would be appointed by the Governor. While the length of terms and the numbers of panel members are details that could be worked out in various ways, the Commission suggests that members be appointed to the panel (which might be known as the "Consolidated Governing Board of Colorado") for terms of nine years. They might then be appointed to the individual governing boards by the panel chairman for terms of three years, with the proviso that after the initial three-year term, the board member would be shifted to a second governing board and after his second three-year term, to the third governing board. (Provision might be made that any person elected as a board chairman might serve for a second three-year term on that governing board.)

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education or a successor coordinating board would continue to function much as envisaged in the law establishing the Commission. Relatively minor changes in the statutes would be desirable to make clear the authority of the coordinating board to recommend and the Legislature to determine tuition charges; and to delineate powers of the coordinating board with respect to new and existing programs of instruction, research, and public service. Under the proposals advanced here, the composition of the Advisory Committee to the Commission would need to be reexamined. With respect to legislative members, consideration might be

given to designating members of the Joint Budget Committee as Advisory Committee members--a provision that could possibly reduce some of the present "layering effect" of successive budget reviews within the total budget review process.

The panel or "Consolidated Governing Board" would have no operating responsibilities other than to provide, in cooperation with the coordinating board, the orientation and continuous education of its members (i.e., the members of the several governing boards) concerning higher education and the relevant problems and opportunities confronting the institutions and boards of higher education in Colorado.

With three governing boards, a three-year term for governing board members and a nine-year term for membership on the panel, the panel would comprise 27 members (or 28 if provision were made that the panel chairman would serve in that capacity alone and not as a governing board member), and the terms of three would expire each year.

(b) Staffing arrangements for the governing boards are of obvious importance; the effectiveness of lay boards lies in a large measure in the capabilities of staff organizations to prepare information and proposals for board action and to carry out board decisions. The elevation of system goals and criteria over institution or sector goals and standards will be difficult or impossible, in the judgment of the Commission, if independent staff organizations are developed which are responsible to each of the sector governing boards. Such organizations are likely, because of the nature of the

responsibilities shared by the governing board and coordinating board, to promote conflict between these boards. They are likely also to increase the potential of undesirable competition between the sectors of the system.

The Commission proposes that the Department of Higher Education, the head of which is appointed by the Commission, should employ all staff and allocate staff to each of the boards operating through the Department.

It can be anticipated that governing boards might wish to employ staff answerable finally to themselves rather than to the head of the Department of Higher Education. However the provisions described above for constituting governing boards would develop within the boards a broader concern for the total higher education program which would tend to parallel the concern of the staff and should make this arrangement practicable. A significant advantage of the staffing arrangement here proposed is that it would provide a single review and assessment procedure at the governing board and coordinating board levels, with the elimination of the current duplication and confusion of effort and with resultant economies in operations.